

Date: Thu, 4 Nov 93 04:30:12 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #415
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 4 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 415

Today's Topics:

 3rd party Flame for Robert
 GAY & QST
 Homonauseated (was: GAY & QST)
 THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Please ..

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1993 07:22:42 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!torn!nott!cunews!freenet.carleton.ca!
Freenet.carleton.ca!aj467@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 3rd party Flame for Robert
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Listen, Einstein,
>Anyone who can't solve a second-order nonlinear differential
>equation doesn't deserve to occupy the same galaxy with those of us who can.
>That includes every ham I ever met - especially the old fuddy-duddy Repeter
>Peters at the ARRL.
>
> don't
>bother crawling out of your sandbox to distract the thought processes of
>intelligent life forms with your pathetic wailings.
>
Hmm! Second-order nonlinear differential equations ... that's what I do in my
sandbox ... my parents wouldn't let me get dirty :-)

--

Bill VE3NJW, VE3NJW@VE3KYT.#EON.ON.CAN

Date: 3 Nov 93 00:14:36 GMT
From: swrinde!news.dell.com!natinst.com!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!
magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!concert!duke!wolves!psybbs!
fredmail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: GAY & QST
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

on <Oct 27 00:29>, Mike Waters to All said:

MW> (5) Isn't there a more appropriate newsgroup for this?

There certainly is, Mike, and I hope they'll listen.

They should try alt.chin.droolers, or rec.mush.headed.feebs ...

Date: Wed, 3 Nov 1993 10:28:03 UTC
From: pipex!sunic!trane.uninett.no!news.eunet.no!nuug!news.eunet.fi!
anon.penet.fi@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Homonaused (was: GAY & QST)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CFu615.9IK@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu
(Jeff
Herman) writes:

>Rumor? Nope. Our campus newspaper runs a weekly column consisting of
>the campus police logbook. Also, I've got to listen to these guys
>everytime I 'visit'.

I'm not sure what this thread has to do with amateur radio anymore, but
Jeff, I'm having difficulty believing your posts. 20 years ago, there were
some (not all) gay men who behaved in the manner you find so obsessively
interesting. But not now. AIDS has very dramatically changed the attitudes
and behavior of gay men. They just don't do that any more.

Can we talk about radio now, please? Like get back to the never-ending
CW-vs-NoCode debate, for instance? Or more creative abuses of autopatches?

Flame bait: I personally think the basic level of theory to get an amateur license should be about that in _Solid State Design for the Radio Amateur_. And 12 or 13 WPM Morse is a perfectly reasonable prerequisite for full privs on HF.

No, my call isn't W7Z0I. I'm better looking. :-) :-) :-)

./Tina

To find out more about the anon service, send mail to help@anon.penet.fi. Due to the double-blind, any mail replies to this message will be anonymized, and an anonymous id will be allocated automatically. You have been warned. Please report any problems, inappropriate use etc. to admin@anon.penet.fi.

Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1993 11:40:21 -0700
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Please ..
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <BugDcc2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, robert@amanda.jpunix.com
(Robert) wrote:

> > >In article <rcrw90-011193100520@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,
> > >Mike Waters <rcrw90@email.mot.com> wrote:
> > >>
> > >>That is essentially why people are proposing to drop the CW test - if the
>
> No, the reason why SOME people have proposed dropping the Morse test
> is to level the playing field, since they have difficulty overcoming
> the code. Awwwww....

Well you can speak for yourself (well you have the privilage if not the capacity), but that is certainly not why *I* signed one of the no code tech. petitions. I am also unaware of anyone else who signed any of the petitions for that reason. Care to cite some specifics?

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

BOBS BEST BENT WIRE SK

Date: 4 Nov 93 01:30:07 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CFsxEF.KGD@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <CFu0FI.Fwn@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>,
<752292578snx@llondel.demon.co.uk>

Reply-To : rcanders@nyx.UUCP (Mr. Nice Guy)

Subject : Re: Morris protesters in England

In article <752292578snx@llondel.demon.co.uk> dave@llondel.demon.co.uk writes:

>In article <CFu0FI.Fwn@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com

(jeffrey.n.jones) writes:

>>In article <CFsxEF.KGD@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff
Herman) writes:

>>>

>>> LONDON (UPI) -- Hundreds of Morris dancers staged a rally in central
>>>London Saturday protesting against the government's planned abolition of
>>>a public holiday they consider to be a unique part of England's history.

And a number of OFs consider Morse code as a unique part of amateur radio.

>>> The May Bank holiday dates back to the mediaeval ages when May Day
>>>was used for great festivities. People would dance around a maypole set
>>>up in towns and villages around the country. The dances became
>>>associated with Morris dances, which were usually danced by five men and
>>>a boy dressed as a girl, called Maid Marian from Robin Hood folklore.

>>

>>Interesting bit of news but what has this got to do with Amateur Radio?

>>

>Absolutely none. Morris Dancing is a form of good old traditional folk
>dancing. Nothing to do with morse code at all. Serves people right for
>mis-spelling morse.

>

To me they both are obsolete skills which are highly regarded by those
who posses them and worthless by those who have no interest in them.

Morse Morris both obsolete skills, there is no difference between them,

--

Rod Anderson	"I do not think the United States government
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu	is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
	fanatics decided to kill themselves"
Clinton, Gore, gone in four	Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1993 11:35:49 -0700

From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-011193100520@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,
<2b3rga\$g5s@news.acns.nwu.edu>, <CFu54M.97y@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Please ..

In article <CFu54M.97y@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu
(Jeff Herman) wrote:

> >In article <rcrw90-011193100520@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,
> >Mike Waters <rcrw90@email.mot.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>That is essentially why people are proposing to drop the CW test - if the
> >>amateur bands are only used by a tiny elite then the feeling is that this
> >>is not the best use of a scarce resource.
> >>
>
> Mike I have to take issue with the phrase 'tiny elite'; several months ago
> someone on .misc, I believe, conducted an informal poll asking readers
> to submit to him the various modes we operate and percentage of time on each
> mode. VHF-FM ranked the highest followed VERY closely by HF CW. Polls
> conducted on USENET might have outcomes that are a bit (ha ha ha) skewed
> but in this case I don't see why the results would be off too much from the
> general ham population.

Out of a total population of 180 million in the US, less than 1 million are
hams. That is a tiny elite in my book. Perfectly acceptable (even
desirable) provided that the "elite" is defined by some method which is
both fair and relevant to the privileges granted. If it is based on a mere
hazing ritual or some other test (like heredity) then it is not only seen
to be unfair, but is almost certain to be changed.

The changes *will* happen, the only real question is whether we as hams
will direct those changes or they will happen despite us.

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

BOBS BEST BENT WIRE SK

Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1993 10:35:30 -0700
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CFs0wD.AKM@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<rcrw90-011193110124@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,

<1993Nov02.125906.9209@anomaly.sbs.com>

Subject : Re: Homonauseated (was: GAY & QST)

In article <1993Nov02.125906.9209@anomaly.sbs.com>, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com
(Rev. Michael P. Deignan) wrote:

> rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

>

> >I strongly object to the view that AIDS victims are somehow "authors of
> >their own misfortune" and should simply be ignored on that basis.

>

> The fact of the matter is that AIDS is a behaviourally-spread disease.
> If you do not engage in any of the high-risk activities, you reduce your
> chances of getting the disease to almost zero.

True, provided you (a) don't ever need a blood transfusion (b) never help
someone in a medical emergency and (c) restrict your sex to solo
masturbation then you are quite safe.

Short of all three of the above you are at risk! Read the Surgeon
General's report from a few years back, it spells out the risks in great
detail.

> >I would suggest you look to Africa where the disease started (about 10
> >years before a group of gay men in the US were infected). In several
> >countries essentially every adult between puberty and 40 years old is
> >infected. I know of no reason why this disease won't follow the same
> >pattern in the US.

>

> The primary reason for disease propagation in Africa was that
> hetreosexual couples routinely engage in anal sex as a birth-control
> measure. This is a far cry from the how and why the disease is
> spreading in the United States.

A few years back every postal address in the US was sent a brochure which
explained that this is simply not true. There are any number of other
sources whgich will confirm this. *ANY* sexual contact produces some risk
- it is that simple. From memory, the ordering of "risk factors" of
various forms of sex are anal sex, vaginal sex, oral sex and then "other
contacts". Women are increasingly being infected from vaginal sex.

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

BOBS BEST BENT WIRE SK

Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1993 11:27:06 -0700

From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <DRT.930ct29204032@cacciatore.mit.edu>,

<rcrw90-011193100520@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>, <2b3rga\$g5s@news.acns.nwu.edu>

Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Please ..

In article <2b3rga\$g5s@news.acns.nwu.edu>, rdewan@casbah.acns.nwu.edu

(Rajiv Dewan) wrote:

> In article <rcrw90-011193100520@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,

> Mike Waters <rcrw90@email.mot.com> wrote:

> >

> >That is essentially why people are proposing to drop the CW test - if the

> >amateur bands are only used by a tiny elite then the feeling is that this

> >is not the best use of a scarce resource.

> >

> >To be "in the public interest" amateur tests need to be relevant, fair and

> >have some relationship to ability to make good use of the resources.

> >

>

> Pardon me. What elite??? There is no secret. Learn the code, which

> BTW is completely under your control, and get the privileges. If you

> cannot do so because of a handicap then the FCC has already provided a

> safety net. Why do you begrudge extra privileges for people who work for it.

> The whole American system is based on the ethic of working for what you want.

It also has a few things about relevencies and not having arbitrary restrictions on things. The point is that CW proficiency is now simply an arbitrary hazing ritual and should be replaced with something more relevant. Anything less is elitism.

> I was not born with knowledge of or facility with code. I worked for it.

> If you want the privileges then so should you.

Look up my call in the callbook - AA4MW, Extra Class. The first AA call ever issued.

My CW speed is around 45 wpm. Yes I worked for it, and in 1961 when I was first licensed it was very useful. That is simply not true today.

I use CW for DX contacts because they are fun and challenging (250 CW countries confirmed), but see no reason why DXing skills that should be required for every ham.

> Must everything be doled out for free?

Why must one suffer hazing for no purpose.

No one is talking about "no test" licenses, merely replacing a no longer relevant CW test with something more relevant to radio operation as it takes place today.

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

BOBS BEST BENT WIRE SK

Date: Thu, 4 Nov 1993 00:28:28 GMT
From: europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CFu54M.97y@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <2b4e26INNc7f@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <CFuoJ8.FtI@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was:

In article <CFuoJ8.FtI@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>In article <2b4e26INNc7f@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM writes:
>>

>>Gee, Jeff, you ought to learn to how to use archives. Here, for example,
>>is the note Gary Coffman sent explaining how he surveyed his local club:
>>
>

>Yes Dana, I recall Gary's poll of his club, and the ensuing comments that
>followed (such as all the HF CW folks might have been at home pounding
>their keys rather than attending the club meeting). Seeing that there
>is a larger cross section of hams on usenet (gad, what's the estimate
>readership here? 50,000 world wide?) I tend to have more confidence
>in the poll taken here than at Gary's local club.

As I recall the usenet "poll", total responses were less than the number of people at the club meeting. And there's certainly reason to assume a strong self-selection bias in the Usenet sample since all respondents were already self-selected by the exam process, and because only those motivated by the Code War responded. The club group was selected solely by whoever showed up for the meeting, not knowing there was going to be a pop quiz. That's a more random sample of amateurs than what was offered in the Usenet poll.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV |"If 10% is good enough | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | for Jesus, it's good | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | enough for Uncle Sam."| emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | -Ray Stevens |

Date: Tue, 2 Nov 1993 20:52:00 GMT
From: walter!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <andy.24.00104545@wco.ftp.com>, <y1gDcc3w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
<SDS.93Nov2132722@cslab8e.cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Re: Why does practice work for you but not for me?

In article <SDS.93Nov2132722@cslab8e.cs.brown.edu> sds@cs.brown.edu (Scott Swanson) writes:

>> Get on-the-air, and make as many contacts as possible. That was my
>> method, and it worked for me. It may work for you, too. Try it.

>

>Not to be a curmudgeon, but how does one get on the air and make
>contacts if one still hasn't passed the 5wpm code test? Seems like a
>catch-22 for me.

> Scott - scott_swanson@brown.edu - n9sat

One way for a "no-coder" to get on CW is to get a few others together periodically using FM simplex on one of the VHF bands. Just key up the FM rig and place the code practice oscillator in front of the mike. There's no reason it shouldn't work just fine for a CW practice session. You could then read the copy you just sent so the others knew exactly what you had been sending.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #415

